

**Remarks**

Reconsideration is requested in view of the preceding amendments and the following remarks. Claims 24-39 and 41-44 are in the application.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claim 28 stands rejected as allegedly indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claim 28 is amended for clarification. Support for the amendment to claim 28 can be found in the specification at, for example, page 5, line 15 to page 6, line 25, and original claims 17-21. No new matter is introduced. In view of the amendment to claims 28, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 in View of Janow**

Claims 24-31, 33-40, and 42-44 stand rejected as allegedly anticipated by Janow, U.S. Patent 6,061,570 (“Janow”). This rejection is traversed.

Claim 24 recites a wireless communication device that comprises a receiver configured to receive a plurality of messages of a first format and a plurality of messages of a second format, and a display configured to present classification information associated with the messages of the first format and the second format. Janow is cited as disclosing such an apparatus at col. 1, lines 43-63, col. 2, lines 30-40, col. 3, lines 4-21, and Figs. 1-3. However, no combination of these portions of Janow teaches or suggests the wireless communication device of claim 24.

According to Janow, a pager (21) and a messaging device (22) communicate with a paging system (20). Voice, email, video, and Internet messaging platforms (10, 11, 12, 13) access the paging system (20). Fig. 1 and col. 2, lines 8-20. Messages arriving at the messaging platforms are analyzed to determine if any paging alert criteria are met, and, based on the determination, a page message is constructed and forwarded to the paging system (20), and the paging system (20) sends a page to pager (21). Fig. 2, col. 1, lines 55-60, and col. 2, lines 45-54. Janow’s page messages can contain information concerning an identification of a messaging platform at which the message was received. According to Janow, messaging services continue to hold messages after the notification process. Col. 1, lines 57-60. Thus, Janow’s pager receives only page messages, not messages of a first format and a second format as recited in claim 24. For at least

this reason, Janow does not teach or suggest the wireless communication device of claim 24, and claim 24 and dependent claims 25-36 are properly allowable over Janow.

Amended claim 37 recites a network device for a wireless infrastructure that comprises a receiver configured to receive messages of at least two types for a wireless network user, and a processor configured to evaluate the received messages based on a predetermined rule set and produce associated message classifications. Janow does not teach or suggest such a device. Instead, Janow teaches a pager (21) that receives paging messages from a paging system concerning communications received at voice, email, video, and Internet messaging platforms. In addition, Janow teaches a messaging platform that contacts a paging system in order to notify a subscriber that a message meeting predetermined criteria has reached the messaging platform. Col. 2, lines 30-40. But Janow's pager/paging system receives only paging messages, not messages of at least two types as recited in claim 37. Therefore, claim 37 and dependent claims 38-39 and 41-43 are properly allowable over Janow.

Amended claim 44 recites a wireless network device that comprises an input configured to receive rules associated with at least two message formats transmitted by a wireless network infrastructure, a memory configured to store the rules, and an output configured to provide the rules to the wireless network infrastructure. Janow does not teach or suggest such a wireless device. According to Janow, subscribers can have standing orders with messaging platforms to contact a paging system whenever messages arrive at the messaging platforms. Col. 1, lines 30-36. Janow does not teach or suggest a wireless network having an input configured to receive rules or an output configured to provide the rules to a wireless network infrastructure as recited in claim 44. Therefore, claim 44 is properly allowable over Janow.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in View of Janow and Keyworth

Claims 32 and 41 stand rejected as allegedly obvious from a combination of Janow and Keyworth II et al., U.S. Patent 5,579,472 ("Keyworth"). These claims depend from allowable claims 24 and 37, respectively, and are allowable for at least this reason.

Conclusion

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, claims 24-39 and 41-44 are in condition for allowance and action to such end is requested. If any issues remain, the Examiner is request to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

By



\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael D. Jones  
Registration No. 41,879

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600  
121 S.W. Salmon Street  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: (503) 595-5300  
Facsimile: (503) 228-9446